

16. Poverty and Human development

According to United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Human Development is defined as "the process of enlarging people's range of choices. The most critical of these wide ranging choices are to live a long and healthy life, to be educated and to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living. Additional choices include political freedom, guaranteed human rights and personal self-respect" (UNDP 1980). The well being of the people are reflected in a range of social outcomes from among which, the Human Development Reports focus on indicators of longevity, literacy and per capita income, thus capturing a quantitative and qualitative aspects of an individual's well being. UNDP through its global Human Development Reports have been in the forefront to generate development reports with a policy focus on broader attitudes of human well-being.

It is pertinent to note that towards the close of the 20th century, there has been a visible shift in the focus of development planning from a mere expansion of production of goods and services and consequent growth in per capita income to planning for enhancement of human well being. The concept of human well being is also conceived to include not only consumption of goods and services but also the accessibility of all sections of population to the basic necessities of a productive and a socially meaningful life. These encompass individual attainments in areas of education and knowledge, health and longevity and the quality of overall social and physical environment of life.

There was a notion that economic prosperity could be measured in terms of per capita income. However, experience has shown that the per capita income does not always ensure enrichment in the quality of life as reflected by the broader dimensions of well being such as indicators of longevity, literacy and environmental sustainability. These are all socially desirable outcomes and therefore carry more weight than the sole per capita income criterion.

Following the UNDP's Human Development framework, Human Development Reports are being prepared at the national and State levels. These reports prepared with the help of sectoral indicators and composite indices try to evaluate development process in terms of ex-post outcomes. The National Human Development Report adopts three critical dimensions of well being viz.

- Longevity - the ability to live long and healthy life;
- Education - the ability to read, write and acquire knowledge; and
- Command over resources - the ability to enjoy a decent standard of living and have a socially meaningful life.

The selection of these indicators has been done with a view to reflect attainments on the three critical dimensions of well being and at the same time enable to ensure the progress in meeting the basic human needs of accessibility to safe drinking water and shelter.

Human Development deals mainly with components, such as productivity, equity, sustainability and empowerment. The concept emphasises the importance of gender equity. Sustainable human development implies engendering the development paradigm. The concept of human development highlights the fact that it is not merely a quantum of growth but its distribution is important. Adoption of UNDP guidelines for the preparation of National and State level Human Development reports facilitates comparison of level of development across various nations and among different States in the country and districts in a State. Human Development reports have developed simple indices such as Human

Development Index (HDI), Gender Development Index (GDI), Gender Empowerment Measure) and Human Poverty Index (HPI).

The parameters constituting HDI are life expectancy at birth, adult literacy rate and the Gross Domestic Product per capita. The parameters for GDI are the same as those for HDI but adjust the achievements as between men and women. GEM captures the inequalities in male and females and the parameters of HPI are the probability at birth surviving age 60, percentage of adults (16 - 65 years) lacking functional literacy skills, percentage of people living below the income poverty line and the rate of long term unemployment (12 months or more). In our analysis HPI for the districts has been assessed with reference to rural poverty ratio estimated by Rural Development Department,

State of Human Development in India:

National Human Development Reports are prepared by the Union Planning Commission and these reports attempt to map the state of Human Development in the country. Quality of life and level of human well being are also being traced across States over a period of time. In the HDR 2001, an important indicator capturing deprivation namely Human Poverty Index has also been estimated and the results are analysed. As per the results, the HDI improved by 26 per cent during 1980s and another 24 per cent during 1990s. The HDI showed a significant overall improvement in the last two decades while there have been wide disparities across the States. The economically backward States have very low HDI. However, inequalities in HDI are less than income inequality reflected in the per capita State Domestic Product.

As per the National Human Development Report 2001, Tamil Nadu has vastly improved its position in human development over the years. Tamil Nadu now stands third among the 15 major States in India next only to Kerala and Punjab. Among the better off States Punjab, Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra had a HD value of above 0.52 against the All India average value of 0.47. The gap between Kerala and the next best State viz., Punjab continues to remain quite significant. By and large, the States continued to maintain the position between 1999 and 2001.

Table-1: Human Development Index (HDI) – Major States

States / UTs	1981		1991		2001	
	Value	Rank	Value	Rank	Value	Rank
Andhra Pradesh	0.298	9	0.377	9	0.416	10
Assam	0.272	10	0.348	10	0.386	14
Bihar	0.237	15	0.308	15	0.367	15
Gujarat	0.360	4	0.431	6	0.479	6
Haryana	0.360	5	0.443	5	0.509	5
Karnataka	0.346	6	0.412	7	0.478	7
Kerala	0.500	1	0.591	1	0.638	1
Madhya Pradesh	0.245	14	0.328	13	0.394	12
Maharashtra	0.363	3	0.452	4	0.523	4
Orissa	0.267	11	0.345	12	0.404	11
Punjab	0.411	2	0.475	2	0.537	2
Rajasthan	0.256	12	0.347	11	0.424	9
Tamil Nadu	0.343	7	0.466	3	0.531	3
Uttar Pradesh	0.255	13	0.314	14	0.388	13
West Bengal	0.305	8	0.404	8	0.472	8
All India	0.302		0.381		0.472	

Note: The HDI for 2001 has been estimated only for a few selected States for which some data, including the Census 2001, was available. The assumptions that have been made for HDI 2001 are indicated in the Technically Appendix..

Gender Equality Index (GEI) in States:

Gender Equality Index measures human development attainments of females as a proportion (percentage) over that of males. The GEI at the National level shows an increase from 62.0 per cent in 1980s and to 67.6 per cent in early 90s. Tamil Nadu, had made considerable progress in the status of women and GEI between 1981 & 1991 and taking 9th place among all States in India. If we count the status in the 15 major States, Tamil Nadu takes the second position during 1991. It is indicative of the fact that State has been endeavouring to improve in all the related areas such as women literacy, IMR, etc.

Table-2: Gender Disparity Index (GDI) : Major States

States	Gender Disparity Index			
	1981		1991	
	Value	Rank*	Value	Rank*
Andhra Pradesh	0.744	2	0.801	3
Assam	0.462	14	0.575	12
Bihar	0.471	13	0.469	14
Gujarat	0.723	4	0.714	6
Haryana	0.536	12	0.714	6
Karnataka	0.707	6	0.753	5
Kerala	0.872	1	0.825	1
Madhya Pradesh	0.664	8	0.662	9
Maharashtra	0.740	3	0.793	4
Orissa	0.547	11	0.639	10
Punjab	0.688	7	0.710	7
Rajasthan	0.650	9	0.692	8
Tamil Nadir	0.710	5	0.813	2
Uttar Pradesh	0.447	15	0.520	13
West Bengal	0.556	10	0.631	11
All India	0.620		0.676	

*- Ranking based on all the States and Union Territories.

*- Rank assigned in order by DEAR.

Source: National Human Development Report 2001.

Poverty Status and Human Poverty Index (HPI):

Poverty is a state of deprivation. The proportion of population not able to attain the specified level of expenditure is segregated as poor. Using such an approach, the Planning Commission, Government of India, has been establishing the Head Count Ratio of the poor at State level, separately for rural and urban areas, for over three decades. The Planning Commission defined poverty line as a minimum consumption expenditure requirement for an average food energy norm of 2400 and 2100 calories per capita per day for rural and urban areas respectively. The per capita expenditure required to meet the above nutritional requirements is upgraded periodically by the Union Planning Commission adopting specific consumer price indices.

Trends in Poverty - Tamil Nadu v/s All-India :

Tamil Nadu has made significant progress in terms of poverty reduction over the last few decades. In the period 1973-74 to 1987-88 the percentage of people living below poverty line in Tamil Nadu was higher than the all-India average. However since then, there has been a dramatic decrease in poverty levels since that time. In 1973-74 the poverty level was 54.94 per cent, it declined to 43.39 per cent in 1987-88 and further to 21.12 per cent in 1999-2000. Moreover, the incidence of poverty was relatively higher in rural areas till 1987-

88 where as it declined steadily during the nineties thanks effective implementation of various poverty alleviation programmes

Table-3: Trend in Incidence of Poverty in Tamil Nadu Vis-a-Vis All-India

Year	Rural		Urban		Combined	
	Tamil Nadu	All India	Tamil Nadir	All India	Tamil Nadir	All India
1973-74	57.43	56.44	49.40	49.01	54.94	54.88
1977-78	57.68	53.07	48.69	45.24	54.79	51.32
1983	53.99	45.65	46.96	40.79	51.66	44.48
1987-88	45.80	39.09	38.64	38.20	43.39	38.86
1993-94	32.48	37.27	39.77	32.36	35.03	35.97
1999-2000	20.55	27.09	22.11	23.62	21.12	26.10

Source: Tamil Nadu Human Development Report.

At the National level, the incidence of poverty declined from 44.48 per cent in 1973-74 to 26.10 percent in 1999-2000. At the State level, the major States like Orissa, Bihar, West Bengal and Tamil Nadu had more than 50 per cent of their population below the poverty line in 1983. By 1999-2000, while Tamil Nadu and West Bengal had reduced their poverty ratios by nearly half (Tamil Nadu 21.12%), Orissa and Bihar continued to be the two poorest States in the poverty ratio of 47 and 43 per cent respectively.

**Table-4: Poverty Profile : State-wise
Number and Percentage Below Poverty Line - 1983, 1993-94 & 1999-2000**

States / UTs	1983		1993-94		1999-2000	
	No. of Persons (Lakh)	% of Persons	No. of Persons (Lakh)	% of Persons	No. of Persons (Lakh)	% of Persons
Andhra Pradesh	164.58	28.91	153.97	22.19	119.01	15.77
Assam	77.69	40.47	96.36	40.86	94.55	36.09
Bihar	462.05	62.22	493.35	54.96	425.64	42.60
Gujarat	117.92	32.79	105.19	24.21	67.89	14.07
Haryana	29.60	21.37	43.88	25.05	17.34	8.74
Karnataka	149.81	38.24	156.46	33.16	104.40	20.04
Kerala	106.77	40.42	76.41	25.43	41.04	12.72
Madhya Pradesh	277.97	49.78	298.52	42.52	298.54	37.43
Maharashtra	290.89	43.44	305.22	36.86	227.99	25.02
Orissa	181.31	65.29	160.60	48.56	169.09	47.15
Punjab	28.64	16.18	25.11	11.77	14.49	6.16
Rajasthan	126.83	34.46	128.50	27.41	81.83	15.28
Tamil Nadu	260.07	51.66	202.10	35.03	130.48	21.12
Uttar Pradesh	556.74	47.07	604.46	40.85	529.89	31.15
West Bengal	318.69	54.85	254.56	35.66	213.49	27.02
All India	3228.97	44.48	3203.68	35.97	2602.50	26.10

Note: Cut off poverty line:

Tamil Nadu - Rural - Rs.307.64 monthly per capita; Urban - Rs.475.60 per capita.

All-India - Rural Rs.327.56 monthly per capita , Urban - Rs. 454.11per capita.

Source: Planning Commission, Government of India.

Incidence of Poverty in Districts:

As there is no region and district-wise data available yet for the 55th round, data from the 50th round (1993-94) have been utilized. The Directorate of Economics and Statistics had attempted a District-wise estimate of poverty ratio for 1993-94, results of which were

adopted in the report on 'Poverty and Inequality' by the State Planning Commission. As per this estimate 31.7 per cent of population in the State was living below poverty line in 1993-94 and the incidence of poverty was higher in urban areas (38.6%) than in rural areas (28.9%).

Table-5: District-wise Poverty Estimates DES

Sl. No.	Name of the District	Percentage of Population Below Poverty Line		
		Urban	Rural	Total
1.	Kancheepuram	33.6	23.4	27.0
2.	North Arcot	53.8	29.6	36.6
3.	Thiruvannamalai	49.7	41.4	42.1
4.	Dharmapuri	27.7	26.6	26.7
5.	Salem	40.5	26.6	30.4
6.	Erode	21.8	17.9	18.3
7.	Coimbatore	27.8	24.4	25.8
8.	The Nilgiris	27.7	17.6	21.2
9.	South Arcot	48.6	51.3	50.9
10.	Thanjavur	52.2	18.4	30.7
11.	Nagapattinam	36.7	15.5	20.2
12.	Thiruchirappalli	27.5	20.8	21.6
13.	Pudukkottai	48.2	23.4	26.9
14.	Dindigul	42.8	47.1	46.3
15.	Madurai	37.6	25.6	30.4
16.	Ramanathapuram	60.7	16.7	25.9
17.	Virudhunagar	38.7	20.1	26.2
18.	Sivagangai	43.0	20.9	26.6
19.	Thirunelveli	56.5	34.6	44.1
20.	Thoothukudi	62.7	37.4	47.0
21.	Kanniyakumari	48.8	48.5	48.6
	State	38.6	28.9	31.7

Source: Poverty and Inequality, SPC.

The districts when grouped according to the levels of poverty are presented below. As per the DES estimates the level of poverty was found to be high in the districts of South Arcot (where more than 50% of the population was estimated to be poor) followed by Kanniyakumari, Tuticorin, Dindigul and Thiruvannamalai. The poverty level was least in Erode district (18.3%).

Table-6: Poverty Ratio-District-wise

Poverty Ratio (%)	D.E.S. Estimate
16 – 20	Erode, Nagapattinam
21 – 25	Nilgiris, Trichy
26 – 30	Ramanathapuram, Kancheepuram, Dharmapuri, Coimbatore, Salem, Pudukkottai, Madurai, Virudhunagar, Sivagangai
31 – 35	Thanjavur
36 – 40	North Arcot
41 – 45	Tiruvannamalai, Tirunelveli
46 – 50	Dindigul, Tuticorin, Kanniyakumari
51 – 55	South Arcot
Total	21 District

Note: DES: Department of Economics & Statistics.

The districts were also grouped into three broad categories, namely high poverty districts (more than 40 per cent of the population living below poverty line), moderately poor districts (30 to 40 per cent living below poverty line) and low level poverty districts (below 30 per cent). As seen from Table below, six districts were considered to be high poverty level districts in 1993-94. four were moderate districts and eleven low poverty districts.

What is noticeable is that Chennai which is a high per capita income district nonetheless had a moderate level of poverty. Moreover, Dharmapuri, a low per income district, is classified as a low poverty district. Another puzzling case is that of Thoothukudi which had high per capita income as well as high poverty level.

Table-7: Districts According to Level of Poverty

Poverty Ratio Range	No. of Districts	Names of Districts
High Poverty (above 40%)	6	Cuddalore, Tiruvannamalai, Dindigul, Thoothukudi, Kanniyakumari and Tirunelveli
Moderate poverty (30 – 40%)	4	Vellore, Salem, Thanjavur and Madurai
Low Poverty (below 30%)	11	Kancheepuram, Dhjarmapuri, Nilgiris, Tiruchy, Pudukkottai, Sivagangai, Coimbatore, Virudhunagar, Ramanathapuram, Nagapattinam, and Erode.

Source: Tamil Nadu Human Development Report, State Planning Commission.

Poverty Levels in Social Groups:

Evidence also exists that the incidence of poverty among the SC and ST population is much higher than the State average for all communities. According to a study by Ray (2000), 48.50 per cent of rural SC and ST households and 56.30 per cent of urban households lived below the poverty line compared to 33.38 per cent of total rural households below poverty line and 34.80 per cent of total urban households respectively in 1993-94. Poverty levels in female-headed households, in both rural and urban areas, were also higher than the poverty levels in all households.

Table-8: Poverty Levels among SC and ST Households, 1993-94

State	Per capita Total Expenditure in Rules			Poverty Percentage		
	All HH	SC/ST HH	FH HH	All HH	SC/ST HH	FH HH
Tamil Nadu - Rural	309.22	252.61	302.87	33.8	48.50	36.80
Tamil Nadu – Urban	483.76	371.45	380.07	34.80	56.30	46.59
All India – Rural	308.27	272.35	326.66	34.40	44.70	32.64
All India – Urban	513.92	433.43	502.61	24.30	32.40	28.45

Note: All HH – Households, SC,ST HH-SC and ST Households and FH HH-Female Headed Households.

Source: Tamil Nadu Human Development Report.

Human Poverty Index:

Human Poverty Index (HPI) was estimated by Union Planning Commission (HDR 2001) with reference to 1981 and 1991. The HPI measures the state of the deprived in the society. The HPI has been estimated to reflect the deprivational perspective on development. Indicators on three aspects of deprivation have been considered to construct the composite index. Deprivation in health and longevity was captured essentially through the proportion of population not expected to survive to age 40 years. In addition, proportion of population without access to basic medical services; proportion of delivery not receiving medical attention; an proportion of children not immunised; were also included to reflect deprivation

in health attainments. These indicators also reflect the economic inability of people to have access to these services.

The HPI takes value between 0 and 100 such that a higher deprivation for a State means a value closer to 100. In this case, it would imply that the entire population of the State is deprived of even the minimal attainments on each of the three dimensions. At the national level, the proportion of the deprived on the HPI was 47.33 per cent in the early eighties. The proportion was significantly higher for rural areas at about 53 per cent, as against about 27 per cent in urban areas. It declined to 39.36 per cent in the early nineties. The HPI for rural areas, on the comparable index, was about 45 per cent and was less than half at 22 per cent in case of urban areas. Thus, the decline in the rural areas was a touch higher than the decline in urban areas, resulting in a marginal decline in the rural-urban poverty gap.

The inter-State differences in human poverty are striking. It ranges between 55-60 per cent in the early eighties for the worse off States, namely, Orissa, Bihar, Arunachal Pradesh, Assam and Uttar Pradesh, and between 32-35 per cent in the better off States like Kerala, Punjab and Himachal Pradesh. The magnitude of HPI in 90s had declined in all the States. The decline in HPI was significant in the case of Himachal Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka and Kerala.

Table-8: Human Poverty Index - 1981 & 1991

States	Human Poverty Index			
	1981		1991	
	Value	Rank*	Value	Rank*
Andhra Pradesh	50.09	20	39.78	19
Assam	56.00	29	48.95	27
Bihar	57.57	30	52.34	32
Gujarat	37.31	10	29.46	13
Haryana	38.97	13	28.55	10
Karnataka	43.96	15	32.70	15
Kerala	32.10	6	19.93	4
Madhya Pradesh	52.15	23	43.47	23
Maharashtra	38.63	12	29.25	11
Orissa	59.34	31	49.85	31
Punjab	33.00	7	25.06	7
Rajasthan	54.16	27	46.67	25
Tamil Nadir	42.05	14	29.28	12
Uttar Pradesh	54.84	28	48.27	26
West Bengal	47.64	17	40.48	20
All India	47.33		39.36	

*- Ranking based on all the States and Union Territories.

Source: National Human Development Report 2001.

In this section the position of Tamil Nadu in respect of HDI, GEI and HPI among the major States in India and a disaggregated analysis at the district level with a view to understanding the regional disparities as estimated by the State Planning Commission for the State Human Development Report are presented.

Tamil Nadu Among Other States:

A look into the development status over a period of time reveals that the overall, HDI has improved significantly between 1980 and 2001. Among the different States there are wide disparities in the level of human development during the 80's. The results shows that Tamil Nadu had vastly improved its position with respect to alleviation of poverty.

BOX

Correlates of Health Attainments - Some Evidence

The importance of health and longevity in the well-being of an individual and their instrumental significance in attaining other personal and socially valued outcomes is not always easy to present. Often the outcomes and efforts involved may not be quantifiable. For instance, *healthy children are more easily able to attend school, pursue education and are likely to find work and be productivity engaged in economic activity*. As a result, they are likely to be better off than those who suffer from ill health. There is, however, ample quantitative evidence on the importance of attainments in other aspects of development in improving health sector indicators.

The data collected for this Report shows that adult literacy, particularly adult female literacy, as well as average consumption levels are significantly correlated with life expectancy at age one, the correlation increasing between 1981 and 1991. Infant mortality rate is also correlated with adult female literacy rate, though not as significantly as in case of life expectancy at age one. It is also observed that adult literacy has a strong positive correlation with the kind of medical attention that is sought at the time of delivery.

Based on analysis of data from 115 low and middle-income countries, it turns out that educational level of adult females as well as generation and utilisation of new knowledge has a significant impact on improving health, longevity and demographic indicators. For instance, in explaining the reduction in under-5 mortality rate, improvement in female life expectancy at birth and reduction in total fertility rate (TFR), the percentage contribution of gain in income levels is less than 20 per cent, whereas improvement in educational levels accounts for more than 30 per cent in the case of two indicators and nearly 60 per cent in case of TFR. The contribution of generation and utilisation of new knowledge is 45 per cent or above in case of the first two indicators and just under 30 per cent in case of TFR.

Source: Estimates made for the Report and Wang etc. al, the World Bank

Inter-District Variations In HDI:

The HDI for the State is estimated at 0.657 State Planning Commission. This value varies between 0.757 to 0.584 at the district level. Chennai district ranks first while Dharmapuri is at the bottom. Chennai district have an HDI value above the State HDI value. Chennai is the only district among the top 5 districts in all human development industry. Next comes Kanniyakumari in literacy, enrolment ratio and longevity, Thoothukudi in literacy and enrolment ratio, Coimbatore in per capita income and longevity, Nilgiris in literacy and longevity and Kancheepuram in per capita income and longevity. Dharmapuri ranks very low in literacy rate and gross enrolment ratio and longevity and Villupuram in per capita income.

A close examination of the achievements in human development index brings out that with low per capita income also some States achieved high levels of literacy (eg. Kanniyakumari) and vice versa i.e., with higher per capita income also in Salem and Perambalur districts the literacy level is remaining relatively low.

Therefore, it must be concluded the accessibility and affordability education and health services is crucial to improve their level of human development.

Table-6: Top and Bottom Five Districts in Human Development Indicators

Indicators	Top 5	Bottom 5
Per capita Income	Kancheepuram Chennai Coimbatore Madurai Thoothukudi	Thanjavur Tiruvarur Sivagangai T.V. Malai Villupuram
Literacy Rate	Kanniyakumari Chennai Thoothukudi Trichy Madurai	Perambalur Erode Salem Villupuram Dharmapuri
Combined Gross Enrolment Ratio	Chennai Thoothukudi Madurai Kanniyakumari Theni	Virudhunagar Kancheepuram Pudukottai Villupuram Dharmapuri
Life Expectancy at Birth	Chennai Kanniyakumari Coimbatore Kancheepuram Nilgiris	Thanjavur Theni Madurai Perambalur Dharmapuri

Source: Tamil Nadu Human Development Report.

Gender Development Index - Inter-District Variations:

The GDI (2001) for Tamil Nadu is 0.654 against the All-India value of 0.560 (HDR 2002). GDI values for the districts in Tamil Nadu vary from 0.766 to 0.582. Chennai fares the highest and Dharmapuri have the lowest score. Women's position was the lowest in Dharmapuri in terms of literacy rate, enrolment ratio and LEB which are reflected in low GDI.

Table-7: District-wise HDI and GDI Values, 2001

District	HDI value	GDI value
Chennai	0.757	0.766
Kancheepuram	0.712	0.710
Thiruvallur	0.654	0.651
Cuddalore	0.644	0.643
Villupuram	0.587	0.582
Vellore	0.658	0.655
Thiruvannamalai	0.612	0.608
Salem	0.626	0.625
Namakkal	0.636	0.631
Dharmapuri	0.584	0.582
Erode	0.658	0.656
Coimbatore	0.699	0.697
Nilgiris	0.685	0.686
Tiruchirappalli	0.671	0.671
Karur	0.647	0.641
Perambalur	0.596	0.592
Thanjavur	0.630	0.629
Nagapattinam	0.654	0.652
Thiruvarur	0.637	0.633
Pudukkottai	0.618	0.615
Madurai	0.661	0.661
Theni	0.628	0.628
Dindigul	0.641	0.638
Ramanathapuram	0.629	0.626
Virudhunagar	0.651	0.649
Sivagangai	0.640	0.635
Tirunelveli	0.658	0.656
Thoothukudi	0.703	0.703
Kanniyakumari	0.711	0.708
State	0.657	0.654
India	0.571	0.553

Source: Tamil Nadu Human Development Report, State Planning Commission.

Link between HDI, GDI and Poverty:

The comparison between HDI and GDI shows that if the GDI rank is less than the HDI value in a district, the position of women in that district is very poor compared to men. If the GDI is greater than HDI, there will be greater gender equality in human development. Chennai, Kanniyakumari, Thoothukudi, Kancheepuram, Coimbatore and the Nilgiris have equal GDI and HDI rank.

Table-8: Comparison of Districts

GDI / HDI	Districts
GDI rank less than HDI rank	1. Cuddalore 2. Vallore 3. Perambalur 4. Madurai 5. Theni
GDI rank equal to HDI rank	1. Chennai 2. Kancheepuram 3. Thiruvallur 4. Villupuram 5. Thiruvannamalai 6. Dharmapuri 7. Coimbatore 8. Nilgiris 9. Trichy 10. Karur 11. Thanjavur 12. Nagapattinam 13. Pudukkottai 14. Ramanathapuram 15. Virudunagar 16. Thoothukudi 17. Kanniyamumari
GDI rank greater than HDI rank	1. Salem 2. Namakkal 3. Erode 4. Thiruvarur 5. Dindigul 6. Sivagangai 7. Tirunelveli

Source: Tamil Nadu Human Development Report.

An analysis has also been attempted to compare the levels in Districts with reference to HDI, GDI and HPI. For HPI rank of districts as per the inverse level of role poverty is considered.

Table-8: Linkage of HDI, GDI & Poverty Ranks

District ranked by HDI	GDI	Poverty inverse rank	District ranked by HDI	GDI	Poverty inverse rank
1. Chennai	1	-	16. Cuddalore	15	-
2. Kancheepuram	2	11	17. Dindigul	17	16
3. Kanniyakumari	3	18	18. Sivagangai	18	8
4. Thoothukudi	4	17	19. Thiruvarur	21	-
5. Coimbatore	5	5	20. Namakkal	20	-
6. Nilgiris	6	3	21. Thanjavur	21	13
7. Trichy	7	10	22. Ramanathapuram	23	6
8. Madurai	8	12	23. Theni	22	-
9. Tirunelveli	9	15	24. Salem	24	12
10. Erode	10	1	25. Pudukkottai	25	10
11. Vellore	11	11	26. Thiruvannamalai	26	14
12. Thiruvallur	13	11	27. Perambalur	27	-
13. Nagapattinam	12	2	28. Villupuram	28	19
14. Virudhunagar	14	7	29. Dharmapuri	29	9
15. Karur	16				

Note: Poverty level is ranked in the increasing order of Poverty Rank increasing with poverty level.

The results show that there is not much positive correlation between HDI and Poverty. Districts with high HDI value also have relatively high incidence of poverty. This may be due to factors other than per capita income / expenditure influencing HDI.

Further, work relating to the preparation of the Second Human Development Report for the State has been taken up. Efforts are also on to ensure that the Human Development becomes the focus of planning. For the first time an innovative attempt is made for furthering the cause of Human Development in Tamil Nadu under which District Development Reports are being prepared for Sivaganga, Thiruvannamalai, Cuddalore, Dindigul and Nagapattinam so that the planning process is informed and guided by Human Development.